

Programme for the Third World War

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

Price: 2/6

K. R. P. PUBLICATIONS LTD. 245, CANN HALL ROAD, LONDON, E11 3NL

By the same author:

THE BIG IDEA

SOCIAL CREDIT

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

THE "LAND FOR THE (CHOSEN) PEOPLE" RACKET

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY, ETC.

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

first appeared serially in *THE SOCIAL CREDITER* between April and August 1943.

Programme For The Third World War

I DON'T know if there are any readers of these words who believe that if Adolf Schickelgruber, better known as Hitler (but perhaps more correctly described as Rothschild), had, in the inscrutable wisdom of Providence, been dropped from a second storey window at an early age, there would have been no World War. There may be. There are kindly people who believe that Henry the Eighth had six wives because he was just unlucky, and that Mr. Anthony Eden goes to Washington at critical periods because he belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel amongst the Christians.

But to any such, I will render the only service to them in my power. I advise them not to read any further. For in this matter, to suppose that the cure for war is to make it impossible for anyone to wage war, is to concede victory to the organisers of the great wars of, at least, the past two hundred years. War is a terrible affliction—none of us at this time is likely to overlook that. But the danger which threatens us is that, in sheer horror of ever more devastating and, so far, completely inconclusive wars, we may surrender to a slavery so far-reaching and irrevocable that its contemplation is a glimpse of hell. Or, shall we say, we are faced with the permanent enthronement of Might divorced from Right, without Might risking even a kick on the shin.

That is, of course, the inescapable alternative so long as we are content to accept the present situation as a war between the Axis Powers and the so-called United Nations. No prize fight promoter was ever put out of business because the contestants were both battered into insensibility and remained permanent wrecks, more especially if he was in a position to arrange that likely bruisers should starve or fight. Anyone who cannot see that the depression of 1929-33 is of a piece with the re-armament of 1933-1939, or who will believe the nursery tales concerning the "Men of Munich" and their efforts to defeat the promoters, can only pray that they may be preserved from foolish speaking.

But there are encouraging signs that prize fights are not taken quite so much at their face value. Without pausing to recall the various reasons which were adduced for the comparatively localised wars of the nineteenth century, and previously, it may be noticed that our wars are, if bloodier and more devastating, proportionately more high-minded and mystical. It may be remembered that the earlier, or 1914-1918, phase of the present war was fought for the purpose of making the world safe for democracy. Democracy in the abstract having been so far removed from Democrats as to be virtually unassailable, and, like a certain well-known brand of whisky, still running and ten times the price, we are now lending to defend the right to be free, thus enthroning Freedom with Democracy,

while bringing Magna Carta and Regulation 18B within the orbit of the Lease-Lend Agreement. Hypocrisy being the tribute which vice pays to virtue, we may at least hope that it shows some indication of becoming more expensive. And it will be noticed that the "B."B.C.'s strongly marked religious fervour (combined with State Socialism) has, with unerring instinct, realised that the primary British need to hear about the weather, which enabled a Hymn to be administered at 10-30 a.m. in "peace" time before the Weather Bulletin, has now been transferred to the curious craving for information as to the exact number of inhabited but unnamed localities freed by our Russian Allies. So we have our Hymn and Alleluia at 7:59—practically a certainty. You get your dose.

But while there appears to be a widening comprehension that the actual labels of -the contestants do not indicate the destination of the major stakes involved, it is nothing less than astounding to observe the inability (to give it the most charitable interpretation) of even the more favourably 5 placed commentators to see the facts which are available to anyone. For instance, Mr. W. Herridge, for some time Canadian High Commissioner in Washington, is sure that we have to do thus and such, or the next war will be between Fascism and Communism. To assess the value of this prevalent idea, let us examine the origins of Fascism and Communism.

II

Most crooks in a big way are Saviours, although, through the ages, at long intervals, there have been Saviours who were not crooks. These latter can generally be identified by the fact that they are unpopular until a long time after their, in the main, violent death. But we are not now concerned with them.

Al Capone saved both the whisky business and the American sufferers from the local urge to mind other people's business and provided the excuse for setting up the American Gestapo, Herr Schickelgruber-Hitler-Rothschild is saving Europe from Bolshevism and providing the opportunity for America to reconstruct Europe and Signor Mussolini has disposed of plenty amidst poverty. The list is in no way exhaustive.

The technique of this saviour business is simple and was well understood by Robin Hood, who took all you had, and gave you back your car fare. Modern Chancellors of the Exchequer, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George who took ninepence from us all and gave some of us fourpence back, subject to tax, regard it as the core of Finance. Generalised, the idea is to arrange an intolerable situation, and save you from it at the cost of accepting one barely tolerable. You are threatened with going all the way to Moscow, if you don't agree to go half way to Moscow. If you don't like Churchill, try Emmanuel Shinwell.

In considering the probable slogan for the next World War now so confidently predicted in well-informed quarters as a preliminary to giving up some more freedoms to avoid 6 it, we shall, I think, be well advised to look at the well-tried principle just enunciated, and to consider whether any developments of the pre-1914 and pre-1939 periods are common to the "improvements" which have been introduced into civilisation, and whether they appear to follow the standard technique. Such an enquiry will be found to provide somewhat remarkable information.

Now, **once you have surrendered to materialism**, it is quite true that economics precedes politics, and dominates it. It is not in Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, and P.E.P. or the London School of Economics Fabian Society that we shall find the origins of what we are looking for. These are ostensibly political systems, and derive from, rather than give birth to economics. While this is obvious and axiomatic, it is not so obvious, although equally axiomatic that the principle works both ways. That is as much as to say, **if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so keep your control of politics—just that long, and no longer.**

Now let us look at the developments in economic control. Don't confuse this with technical progress, with which it has nothing whatever in common. Probably the most important aspect of this subject is one with which the general public is completely unfamiliar, although some of its component members might be interested to know that the curious, illogical, and immensely publicised attack on what is called "the profit motive" is designed to

provide what Lord Stamp called suitable psychological preparation. To the small circle familiar with the subject, it is known by the innocent title of "management control."

It may perhaps be remembered by those who notice such things that one of the usual and effective replies to the complaint of oppression by large corporations, banks, railway and public utility companies, etc., is that the average shareholding in them is of the order of a few hundred pounds. The personal control of the partner or majority stockholder has been replaced by the small shareholder. The argument is of course exactly the same as that which measures democracy by the percentage of the population having votes. That is easy to apprehend when your attention is drawn to it. What is not so easy, and requires a good deal of technical knowledge of a highly specialised kind, is to understand the rapid and extensive, and very silent revolution which has been taking place in the legal power of the stockholder over an undertaking for which (on the idea of the reality of money) he provided the capital. Since most of this alienation is the work of German-American-Jewish lawyers, commonly called Corporation Counsel, it had, up to the outbreak of the present hostilities, developed further in Germany and America than in Great Britain. Possibly with the able assistance of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jr., of the U.S.A., who has been here for some time, there are signs that we are catching up, and the organisation of the Bank of "England" is clearly devoted to it.

However that may be, it is patent that the separation of ownership from control, which is a feature of stock dispersal and legal devices such as voting trusts (one of which has just been constituted by Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, in respect of the arbitrary acquisition of Messrs. Short Bros.), proxies, and other devices, is being pursued systematically in regard to industrial property, just as it is, under the agitation for "nationalisation," in regard to land and credit.

It would take us much too far afield to pursue this aspect of the policy into its amazing ramifications. But two results are significant. The first is that the shareholder is at the mercy of the stock-market. His connection with what was originally his property is little more than the loose expectation that a group of men, who have nothing to expect from him and little to fear, will consider his interests, which they are continually told by the "B."B.C. and the Arch-bishops, are dubiously moral. Most shareholders would agree that they don't get much consideration and will get less. If his stock is not exchangeable for valuable considerations (and who controls the Stock-Market?) he is expropriated.

The second is that he can have no say in the use that is made of "his" property. It becomes, in theory, the tool of a neutral technocracy, but anyone of ordinary common sense knows that it obeys the policy of whoever appoints the management. Let us say, capturing export trade. It is the International Banks who appoint the management.

This systematic separation of control from ownership and responsibility began in Germany during the days of Ballin, Rathenau, Bleichroeder, Deutsch and others of the Jewish ring of bankers and industrialists who surrounded the Kaiser. It was transferred to the United States by the Warburgs, Schiffs and Strausses with such lawyers as Felix Frankfurter assisting. The core of the idea is power without responsibility. You cannot effectively punish a corporation or sue a Government Department.

It should be noted that this technique was highly developed many years before either Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, or P.E.P. were heard of. Bearing this in mind, we are in a position to follow the technique into governmental systems, and to consider the activities of various contemporary (if temporary) celebrities.

III

The practical history of Bolshevism may be said to commence with the financing of Japan in the 1904-1905 War against Russia. The Japanese Minister of Finance Takahashi wrote a Memorandum to the Japanese Government, in which he said:—

"Mr. Schiff had a grudge against Russia on account of his race. . . . for this purpose it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war a welcome opportunity to give effect to his cherished idea." (**Jacob Schiff, Life and Letters**, by Cyrus Adler.)

The immediate result was the issue of the Imperial Japanese Government 6 per cent. **Sterling** (not dollar) Loan.

It might appear, at first sight, that this transaction was merely a routine example of financial practice, similar, for instance, to the assistance given to Hitler by the Bank of "England" under Mr. Montagu Norman, which was so helpful in enabling Germany to re-arm.

But I think that there are differences. It is true that Mr. Norman has expressed his contempt for the general population in no uncertain terms ("The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on"). On the other hand, he has also re-gretted that he is no economist, and does not know what to do (**Montagu Norman: A Study in Financial Statesmanship**, by Paul Einzig). So we must assume that he is only the broker's man. To know with certainty whether there really are differences between financing Hitler and financing Bolshevism, we should of course require to know who is the broker. But to revert to Mr. Schiff.

It should be realised that the effect of his initiative on this occasion was to set the British to work (it was a Sterling Loan) to build up the Japanese Navy, because Mr. Schiff, like all his co-racialists, dislikes culture, and prefers Kultur. The object is clearly stated—an American, or German (without reference to dates, it is difficult to say) Jew, he "deemed fit" to put the British to war against "the ruling classes of Russia" as "an object lesson."

At the same time: "The subsidies granted to the Nihilists at this period by Jacob Schiff were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian Terrorist organisation had been set up in the U.S.A. at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries, charged to assassinate Ministers, governors, heads of police etc. . . . and to create insurrection. . . . the cost was estimated at more than fourteen million [gold roubles]" (**Figaro**, Paris, February 20, 1932). Of course it all came back ten times over in profits from the "re-construction" of Russia. To quote the banker's hymn: "Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee, repaid a thousandfold shall be."

Now, before briefly considering the consequences of this operation, I think it is important to be quite clear that the merits or otherwise of the Russian Imperial Government, **from the point of view of the Russians**, are not in question. The only point on which we can be certain is that no Russians have figured in general intercourse outside Russia since it disappeared. Whatever the results, and we are beginning to experience them now, the "ruling classes" were to be taught a lesson because they were not willing to take orders from a German Jew resident in America. That the results to the **Russians** were of no consequence, is demonstrated by the fact that many millions of Russians, not of "the ruling classes" perished, and millions more were reduced to poverty and exile, by the Bolshevik Revolution. But no Jews. Soviet Russia is "presented" to Europe and America and represented by two Jews, Maisky and Litvinov, who are as typically Russian as a Sassoon is typically English.

Of course the consequences were much wider. In the article in the **Ottawa Citizen**, by Mr. Herridge, to which reference has already been made—an article which reads like the *rechauffe* of a conversation with an exponent of international Freemasonry—amidst a welter of what, without wishing to be offensive, I can only describe as dangerous nonsense, he remarks, "Germany attacked; a fact of only tactical significance. For if Germany had not attacked, Russia would have." In that I am sure he is right, and that the social and economic structure both of Russia and Germany make war certain.

It is not too much to say that the consequences of the activities of Mr. Schiff, his firm, and his associates were:--

(1) The inauguration of an Asiatic war complex, accompanied by a delusion that the day of the white man was over, not merely in Asia, but everywhere. "Pearl Harbour" was conceived in New York. Trouble in India dates from the beginning of this century, and was hardly existent before. Yet political reform in India has been rapid and continuous.

(2) The World War had as its fundamental idea "**Drang nach Osten**." A weakened Russia, like all these World Revolution movements, played straight into the hands of Germany—the Germany of Frederick the "great" who is now being idealised by Goebbels.

(3) The transfer of the subversive activities of international finance to France and England. The technique of flooding the country with refugees, many of them propagandists, is a repetition of the period following the French Revolution. How is it that no Socialist Party has ever attacked Finance? How is it that the programme of the Commonwealth Party (notice the Cromwellian touch) reads like a banker's dream?

Russia is a country of nearly 200,000,000 people with vast resources. The individual Russian has always been a brave and fatalistic soldier. For twenty years, the Soviet Government has been preparing for war. Where is all this propaganda coming from, which in quarters accustomed to denounce war as a capitalist trick, heralds as an immense military achievement **derived from the Soviet system**, the very desirable, but surely not very remarkable fact that 200,000,000 of people, fighting on their own soil, on short lines of communication, have held up (if they have held them up), **one** enemy fighting on lengthening lines of communication while an allegedly inefficient country of 45,000,000 held up three empires, and assisted the Russians? Who in their senses could argue that the most backward and illiterate country in Europe is the pattern for the rest? To anyone who will consider the evidence, I cannot see any conclusion from it but one—that the totalitarian state in all its forms is a gigantic plot against civilisation, and that only political adolescents could fail to see that it proceeds from an international source, using international bribery for the benefit of an international caste to whom all cultures and races, but one, are foreign.

The object of the various New Orders is simplicity itself—it is to prevent the rectification of the defects in the organic growth of civilisation, almost all of which proceed from the Finance which the New Order mongers never attack.

IV

A deceased diplomat, whose superb self-confidence adorned an almost invincible stupidity, explained the ideals of what, for brevity, we may term the Chatham House Gang.

Speaking at a dinner in New York just before the war, he remarked, "Peace comes from there being overwhelming power behind Law." The capital letter was, I think, in the original report. The speaker did not explain whose Law, or whose power.

Apart from the fairly obvious fact that more elaboration would appear to be required on these two matters, I feel that a little de-bunking of Law with a capital letter is both necessary and desirable at this time. Both the word and the thing are becoming overworked.

In parenthesis, the kind of Law in the abstract to which reference is made in the speech just recalled has many characteristics which distinguish it from natural law. For the moment, it is only necessary to refer to one. It is almost invariably negative—"Thou shalt not—." It is an interesting indication of the origins of the Law, that nine out of ten of the Commandments of the so-called Mosaic Law are negative, while the sole Commandment of the New Testament is positive.

I think that the important point to recognise is not merely the minus sign of the Law (because there is room for a good deal of elaboration on that point) but that negative direction is almost invariably a sign of immaturity **when taken by itself**. All children love to order people not to do things. Beginning with "naughty dolly," they work up to a point, usually reaching a maximum at about the age of eighteen, in which almost everything is coded—it is either "done" or "not done." Quite a lot of people never get past that stage, particularly if their life is spent in office work. The perfect comment on this kind of Law is that of William Blake, the poet and mystic, who said that, "One Law for the lion and the lamb, is oppression."

While, in the last analysis, I think this goes to the root of the matter, it would be absurd to suggest that enforceable law has not a quite limited use. The Common Law of England worked on the whole to the general benefit, largely because it always had regard for the fundamental maxim *De minimis non curat lex*—the law is not concerned with trivial matters. And it is small matters which make up the essential life. The principle has only to be stated for us to see how far we have departed from it, and how fantastic it is to have an organisation which is forever grinding out new laws. But that is something else again.

While this place for law in its proper place, and stripped of the nonsense of majesty and sanctity, may be admitted, it is yet possible to say, I think without any effective reply, that **Law becomes more irrational, oppressive, and ultimately intolerable as the number of persons affected by it increases**. So far from the ideals of the Chatham House Gang having any basis in inductive experience, only "intellectuals" encouraged by gangsters could fail to see that Home Rule movements are an affirmation of the healthy reaction against the

World State. "Equality under the Law" is primarily intended to benefit the lawyers and their friends. So far from peace proceeding from it, there is not a country in Europe which is not seething because of it. Of course, it is open to anyone to say, as in the case of Dr. Temple, that "we need supremely the control of human purpose" and to defer the explanation of what you mean by human purpose and who "we" are.

For my own part, I am satisfied that this reaction against legislation is easily the most hopeful outcome of the war so far. No people ever became great by passing laws, and the combined tendency to regard law as a substitute for action, while abandoning industry for bureaucracy, is one of the most dangerous symptoms of racial degeneracy.

I am personally familiar, from a position of comparative detachment, with the working of two Government "spending" Departments.

The human material in them is usually good, but deteriorates rapidly. One of these Departments, the first example of nationalised industry, the Post Office, is a proof of the greatness of this country. No country which had not immense powers of endurance could sustain an organisation such as the Post Office, and survive.

In order to reconcile this with a fair, but rapidly deteriorating postal service, it must be realised that a very high proportion of the work of the Post Office is not done by the Post Office staff. It is done by the commercial organisation of the country. Practically the whole of its material is bought; nearly all of its transportation is contracted for by "outsiders"; and a high proportion of the most troublesome collection and distribution is the work of small sub-post offices which double the job with that of the village shop. With the exception of telegraph and telephone maintenance, and the mechanical equipment of the large city post-offices, the main function of the Postmaster-General's Department is that of a pure bureaucracy, operating under a set of intricate "Laws" known as Regulations. If a commercial undertaking of comparable size had the "overheads" of the Post Office, and dealt with its problems by the same methods, it would not stay in business for six months.

The ostensible work of this swollen bureaucracy consists in writing "Minutes" in "Files"; and the art of writing minutes consists in never by any chance committing yourself to any responsibility for anything whatsoever. But, in fact, the main employment of these huge staffs is departmental intrigue mixed to an increasing extent with OGPU-Gestapo practices. They are riddled with Freemasonry; their Class Distinctions, like those of the Communist Bureaucracy in Russia, far exceed those of so-called capitalist society, any activity requiring practical knowledge being confined to the Lower Orders.

While I am confident that before much time has passed something will have to be done with the Post Office by someone, my object in expressing a mild and limited opinion on its merits is simply that in it we have a working model of what a complete bureaucratic state would be like. And the almost incredible fact is that the great mass of the population outside these organisations (in the main hypnotised by the economic security attached to State employment) have no idea of the facts, which are simply that the weight of them, which grows daily, is carried by the diminishing number of people who do any useful work; and that the economic security is simply parasitism.

The Post Office is Socialism in being under the most favourable conditions. It is a monopoly; it relies on a more efficient system to do most of its hard work at low pay; it is grossly overstaffed and has much more than its fair share of Jews in key positions. It is rigid and lacking in initiative; always looking for a reason why something should not be done, rather than why it should be done. It is impossible to hold it responsible for anything, and like internal Russia its one fear is publicity.

With this picture of Socialism under the most favourable conditions in our minds, we can consider the links between the inauguration of the Socialist State, Russia and the Fascist State, Italy, the allegedly opposing system.

One of the ideas essential to any understanding of genuine political activity can perhaps be most easily expressed in the language of gambling. To the roulette player, *Rouge et Noir* is a game of chance. To the keeper of the Bank, it is a certainty.

To the Stock Exchange gambler, gain or loss on a stock movement depends on whether he is a bull or a bear. To the Stock-Broker, all that matters is that enough people shall buy and sell stocks. In this case, his percentage is a certainty. To the racegoer who backs the favourite, the victory of an outsider means loss; to the bookmaker it merely means a larger gain than if the favourite won.

I do not think that the importance of understanding this principle can be over-rated, because the manipulation and perversion of the gambling spirit is of the very essence of International policy. The fundamental idea is always to play a long-term certainty against a short-term possibility so that a win for the genuine gambler is at best or worst only a postponement of the inevitable final loss. It is called insurance.

I can imagine that someone who has not devoted much attention to the subject may observe that anyone who gambles deserves to lose. That is the Whig idea, propagated to justify the fact that Whigs only invest in a certainty. But; in fact, gambling is a special form of the adventurous spirit from which all progress is born, whereas insurance is a financial fallacy; and no greater disaster can overtake a community than to lose the spirit of adventure. That is why a mass of Law which smothers initiative and substitutes a Beveridge insurance plan for the dividends of an advancing adventure is a creeping death.

Now, World War, Parts I and II, like all previous wars, is a gamble between A and B for the certain advantage of C. It is essential that the Programme of Part III shall be the combination of A and B for the elimination of C. Since the position of C rests on an abstract fallacy his effective elimination is in sight.

The derivation of Bolshevism, as we have seen, covers a fairly lengthy period. Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a title contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of "German" National Socialism, or P.E.P., is localised centralisation in order to transfer power to International Centralisation—as you might say, "C." It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government.

Now, it is important to observe that, subject only to modifications to suit the climate, the advent of the New Order in Italy followed almost exactly the same essential process as that which established Lenin and Trotsky. Italy has always been riddled with secret societies. She sustained heavy defeats in the 1914-1918 phase of the war, and these defeats were followed by social and industrial disorganisation, which culminated in the seizure by the "workers" of Italy's most famous engineering organisation—the Fiat Works at Turin. The seizure was complete, but the "workers" found to their astonishment that you can't eat motor-car parts, and that the banks require certain formalities to be observed in regard to the signature of cheques.

The Italian is no fool, and the whole of this "Communist" seizure of the Fiat factories has a curious air, more particularly since within a short period of time after the meek restoration of the works to the management, it became known that "American" interests had taken over Fiat. But it was clearly a highly effective excuse for drastic action, and the financial controllers of Italy, Counts Volpi and Pirelli, produced a Saviour who had a long reputation as a Socialist. The March of the Black Shirts on Rome, led from behind by Mussolini in a "train de luxe" (a march which could have been stopped by a battalion of regular soldiers), announced the Dawn of the New Day, and, as in Russia, wages dropped to subsistence level and strikes became a thing of the past. Both Bolshevism and Fascism had a short way with strikers.

VI

To those who wish for considerable elaboration on the point, there is available a mass of documentary and other evidence to establish three common factors in the essential nature of the Russian Revolution, the Fascist Coup d'Etat, and the National Socialism of Hitler's Germany. These factors are

- (1) They all claimed to be Socialism, and, in fact, are Socialism, in the only sense in which Socialism appears to have any definition—the subordination of the individual to the omnipotent State and those behind the State;
- (2) They were all financed from the richest and most powerful financial groups in the world, all three having verifiable connections with Wall Street and Pine Street, New York;
- (3) They all suppressed "the right to strike" with ruthless physical force.

Doubtless to a less degree, these three characteristics are identifiable in the United States, under the name of the New Deal, and in the peculiar rush of post-war control measures known as "Planning," in once-great Britain.

It is fairly obvious that we are faced, perhaps for the first time in history, with an attempt to superimpose on the entire world, from some pervasive and undisclosed centre, "overwhelming power behind Law." There are local variations; but the Big Idea can be identified without difficulty.

It is a situation which I think can be called formidable. To obtain a detached view of it, requires some reconsideration of the way things happen. It cannot be in the limits available a comprehensive survey; but it is essential that it should be realistic. Let us begin with slavery. The word itself, which is probably German, meaning a Slavonic captive, is one of a group of magical words, the use of which can usually be guaranteed to create an illusory emotional picture in place of a reasoned idea. To most people in these islands, it is a curious mixture of brutal overseers flogging aged saints, and women and children on ice floes being chased by bloodhounds. Yet at the same time, its chronology in most people's minds is more or less in the far distant past.

The facts, of course, are that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is about as true a **general** picture of negro chattel slavery as that which is being presented to the American public at the present day of British rule in India. Negro slaves (to put the matter on the lowest grounds) were property, and continuous ill-treatment was bad business. I doubt very much whether ill-treatment of slaves in the Southern States ever compared with the vicious cruelty of English industrial conditions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, or was even very much worse than the treatment of negroes in parts of the Southern States in recent years. That is not the point.

The second point which is curiously overlooked is that, if we regard the American war of Abolition as the end of **official** slavery in "white" countries, there are plenty of individuals still living who were born slaves. The point I wish to make is that the economic structure of the world from pre-historic times to within living memory was founded upon a slave class and some form of slavery was regarded as, and probably was, inevitable. And during this very long period, there is little evidence of unrest, and no evidence that such conditions as, for instance, the nail-makers of Cradley Heath, or the child labour which made the fortune of Engels, the patron of Karl Marx, endured, would have been, or was, tolerated by public opinion. Yet, not slavery, but conditions under which slavery operated, have undoubtedly been distorted and exaggerated.

When a false picture of something is circulated on a large scale, experience teaches us to look contemplatively at the remedy, and in this connection we can, I think, derive useful information from the well-known letter written by an "American" banker towards the close of the American Civil War:—

"Chattel slavery will be abolished by the war, and this we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of labour, and involves the care of the slave. We can obtain the same result with less trouble by controlling the money."

We notice at once that the effect of the substitution of what labour agitators call wage-slavery, for chattel slavery was firstly to increase the demand for money, and so enhance the power of the banker and money-lender, and secondly to make economic insecurity of the "worker" an essential feature of the new system.

When, however, power-production made obvious the threat of economic plenty for all, it also made obvious the political impossibility of maintaining for much longer the sanction of economic security. It is perhaps not too much to say that the abolition of slavery became practicable with the invention of the steam engine. Perhaps it now becomes clearer why "the right to strike," i.e., the right to contract-out, is eliminated from the New Orders. It is, precisely, the dividing line between slavery and Freedom, and was first denied by the Trades Unions. We are, in fact, reverting to chattel slavery because of the breakdown of wage-slavery, and it is recognised that the slaves must be well fed and looked after, because they are property. And it will be remembered that no slave

could own property, because it would enable him to contract out, so, for the slaves, property must be abolished, i.e., "nationalised."

I am confident that we should be much helped in our consideration of the events of 'the past fifty years, if not before, if we had access to the records of the "**Alliance Universelle pour l'Action Maconnique**" whose permanent headquarters are in Algiers—where General Eisenhower's headquarters are, you know. Or even to the Minutes of the Meeting in 1920. Perhaps Admiral Leahy, until recently U.S. Ambassador to Vichy, who, if I am not mistaken, was present, could assist.

Meanwhile, it appears desirable to consider the truth, if any, in the statement that men are born free and equal, and in the light of our conclusions, why Columbus discovered America. There must be some excuse for him.

VII

The claim that "all men are born free and equal," if anyone makes it, clearly rests, even to be arguable, on the proposition that each new birth is a new individual, *ab initio*. This idea meets with little support nowadays. Without calling in the various doctrines of reincarnation anyone who will spend a little time observing half a dozen babies of about twelve months old must admit wide differences, not to be accounted for by either health or environment. The human infant almost certainly begins a new day with certain individualities, however acquired, and "equality in individuality" is one of those combinations of words which have to be translated into usable form to be believed.

As to all men being born "free," it is, in these days, difficult to grasp what the claim meant. Obviously every infant is under compulsion to breathe and to be fed. That it comes passively under the human laws which claim to protect it from murder, cruelty, and neglect, is just as much a negation of the statement that it is born free, as if these laws imposed a handicap upon it.

While the phrase "equality of opportunity" is being substituted for the cruder idea and freedom has moved out into mid-Atlantic, the claim is in essence still much the same. It is that, by passing Education Acts, sterilising the unfit, punitive taxation, Planning the Land, and killing initiative along the well-tried lines developed in the Post Office, we are ushering in the age of the Common Man, whom God must have loved because he made so many of him. (At this point, the organ will please play *Land of Hope and Glory*.) In the meantime, however, we are unfortunately unable to find a cure for the common cold.

There is, of course, a radical difference between the repudiation of the idea that all men (and women) are equal or are born equal, which seems to me to be demonstrably untrue, and the *non sequitur* that the differences in economic and social status in individuals which exist at the present time are correct reflections of individual differences. They certainly are not. There are "reincarnation" theories which appear to claim that they are—that every individual has created the circumstances in which he now lives by his actions in the past. Apart from many other objections to this idea in the realm of philosophy, it appears to be logically indistinguishable from determinism.

But what is true and important, I think, is that the ideas being so widely propagated by Marxists and others, that the characteristics of a race, not to say an individual can be revolutionised in a lifetime, are not merely nonsense—they are deadly, dangerous, nonsense.

I do not believe that the individual character is much changed in one lifetime. People become a little wiser, or a little more foolish, a little kinder, or a little harder, a little more reliable or a little less honest. They may and do take veneers, but the real wood changes slowly. I do not believe there is any ascertainable difference in the Russian of to-day, and the Russian of the Czarist period, other than the disappearance of a travelled and at any rate superficially cultured class who were certainly more decorative.

As the logical, as well as factual consequence of this, the comfortable idea that the human race has made great progress in the past five hundred years is largely dispelled. Dr. Tudor Jones expressed this opinion (I think on

anatomical and biological grounds) several years ago. My own opinion is based on a closer study of fourteenth century documents than has been feasible to me until recent years.

This fact, if, as I believe, it is a fact, goes right to the root of social science. It is an immediate and devastating answer to the idea that you can conceive, or "Plan" a social system, and then fit people into it. You simply haven't got the people, and can't get them before your gim-crack system breaks down. Still further, you get increasing maladjustment of the "progressed" individuals who do exist, and you open the way to exactly the kind of leadership from which the world is now suffering—and not only in Germany.

It is really astonishing how irrational and mutually exclusive are some of the current ideas of a new society. For instance, "competition" is held up as wasteful and anti-social. Yet if "equality of opportunity" means anything at all, it means that anyone is free to compete for anything, on a scale far beyond such competition as now exists. It may be noticed in passing that "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is a phrase admittedly of Masonic origin. Yet the very essence of Masonic organisation is inequality, "degrees," "craftsmen," "Masters," and "Grand Masters," and the extraordinary technique of secrecy and remote control.

Fifty year ago, the number of General Managers of British Railways ran into hundreds. Admittedly some of these were very minor posts, but the simple fact is that hundreds of railwaymen had a chance to obtain a type of experience they coveted. I doubt if, in the old sense of the word, there is one General Manager of a British Railway nowadays. There are, for the moment, four obedient employees of the Bank of "England" who may, for all I know, use that title. I hope they like their job. I don't like their railways. The ordinary railwayman has about as much chance of becoming G.M. as of becoming Lama of Tibet.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is the same conclusion at which one arrives, so far as I can see, by every route. The problem to be solved is not to provide a world for heroes, which by experience not merely requires a hero to live in it, but ensures that he shan't live in it long. It is to prevent the heroes from turning the world into a monopoly for heroes, so that old ladies can do a nice bit of knitting without being blown through the window by a hero practising.

Which brings us to Columbus.

VIII

The curious myopia (possibly resulting from the exoteric interpretation of Genesis which was supposed to indicate the date of creation as about B.C. 4000) which regards history as the events subsequent to the landing of Norman William, with his select body of Jews, in A.D. 1066, enables the statement that "Christopher Columbus discovered America at the end of the fifteenth century" to be accepted as accurate. Apart from the fact that Columbus never saw America, the mainland of which was "discovered" by John Cabot, who sailed from Bristol in 1497, there is strong reason to believe that various Scandinavian peoples had fairly constant intercourse with the North American Continent hundreds, if not thousands, of years earlier. Their traditional name for it was Markland.

There are, however, certain features in regard to the rediscovery of America which are worth attention. Christopher Columbus was a Jew, and John Cabot, although his ship and crew were English, was a Venetian. But the extraordinary and significant fact is that there was in Bristol at that time a secret Jewish community 'who handed on their tradition by word of mouth' (Lord Melchett: *Thy Neighbour*, p. 90).

It is obvious that both Columbus and Cabot had information of a fairly definite character to guide them. Both of them set a compass course which was approximately correct. And both of them had connections with banking—Columbus with Jewish banking, and Cabot with the banking City-State of Venice, and almost certainly with this secret Bristol Jewry. The essence of banking has always been what in military circles is called "intelligence"—information in its widest sense, spying being an important component, and it seems highly probable that the existence of the American continent was known in banking circles when it was quite unknown outside them. If this was so, it is reasonable to assume that when action was taken in regard to this knowledge it was considered action.

Quite a different type of individual is required to pioneer a new country from that required to develop it subsequently; and it is not without significance also that the original British settlers were followed by a wave of Dutch, who for the most part remained on the Atlantic seaboard as traders and bankers. One of the real effects of the American War of Independence was that although a facade of the original settlers of British stock held most of the titular offices of Government, the control of development and policy rapidly passed to a tiny Dutch minority (not to be confused with the much larger German element frequently called Dutch in the United States by a corruption of the word *Deutsch*). Such names as Roosevelt, Astor, Vanderbilt, Van Rensselaer, Van Cortlandt, etc., immediately occur to anyone in this connection. The Dutch were the Chosen Instrument of Finance.

This is not an attempt to write a history of the United States. It is a suggestion that the United States is a definite and very important item in a plan which was interrupted by the expulsion from England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries of the Jews and their associates whom we now call Freemasons, but who were then called Knights Templars.

By common consent, the real framer of the Declaration of Independence was Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson's mother was a Randolph—probably, with the Lees of Virginia, the most aristocratic family of the New World. There is quite indisputable evidence that Jefferson was an international Freemason, and that the revolutionary elements in America, who were greatly in the minority, were the same elements who were fomenting trouble in France (Jefferson was actually United States Ambassador to France at the time of the fall of the Bastille).

The famous phrase "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness" originally read "Every man is entitled to the possession of life, liberty and property," and Jefferson in person struck out "property" and inserted the quite meaningless abstraction "the pursuit of happiness."

Jefferson was almost a perfect example of the aristocratic abstractionist—the man who is born with a power complex which he inherits, who disdains apprenticeship to his constitution-making. He was a student and a lawyer from the age of seventeen, and nearly every one of his policies was in direct conflict with his own mode of life and fundamental sympathies, and conveys the suggestion of outside influence on inexperience. Although he was President (a very different office to that now attached to the title) and is credited with the Louisiana Purchase, the picture presented of his Administration is that of a man with an inherited aptitude for dealing with large matters, but taking his instructions on them without much consciousness of the reality they embody.

Perhaps the most indisputable evidence that I am not unduly fanciful in this matter is provided by the Great Seal of the United States, which was the work of Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, all Freemasons, the obverse of which consists of a truncated pyramid, with the headstone **bearing a picture of the All-Seeing Eye**, the symbol of Freemasonry, suspended above the Pyramid. The motto is "*annuit coeptis*"—"he prospers our origins."

The pyramid is the symbol of world-government. The rest of the symbolism is obvious. Seen in the light of this clue, the history of the United States is consistently bound up with Whiggism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and with the "mergers," financial buccaneering, and political corruption of the super-capitalism which accompany Judaeo-Masonry. The political corruption is not adventitious—it is essential. The type of Government, and the type of legislator in the main prevalent in this country during the last half of the Victorian era, although very far from ideal, would never have tolerated for a week the financial piracy of the Vanderbilt-Harriman era which co-existed with it in the United States. It is not brains of which the Plotters are afraid—it is integrity. This type of British Government was definitely one of tradition, not of expediency, and traditional Government imposes certain standards in much the same way that a Gothic Cathedral discourages ribaldry.

In 1935, a year which probably marked the disappearance of any real prospect of peace, the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury announced that in future the obverse of the Great Seal would be printed on the back of all U.S. paper money.

I should like to emphasise, for the benefit of those to whom it is necessary, that not only is the mass of the modern American people unconscious of the part it has been billed to play, but is very uneasy as to its part in world affairs.

Whether leading American statesmen understand the situation is also not plain. I rather doubt it. But that there is a small inner ring which does, I am confident. I have met at least one of them. One of our nineteenth century statesmen begged Englishmen to cultivate the habit of studying large maps. With a world war on our hands, we require above most other things, to realise that evil designs can be, and are, built up from innocuous components, and in consequence, short views of history may be very deceptive.

IX

Although British professional, trained, diplomats, like British Generals, are all incompetent, ill-informed, and old-school failures, immeasurably inferior both in intelligence and judgment to the staffs of the *Daily Worker* and its threepenny edition, nevertheless in their unanimity on the German mentality they are supported by so many foreigners that we must reluctantly accept their view. Germans from the time of Frederick the "Great," whether under Monarchies, Republics, or National Socialism, have, as a people, part of them actively, and the rest of them passively, accepted war as the primary national industry.

Now, so-called democracy is definitely pacifist and strongly pro-German, while Socialism both in Russia and Germany is strongly militarist. The pseudo-democrat of Great Britain or the United States views war with weary distaste and is not easily persuaded to retain sufficient armed strength to enable his diplomats to make their voices heard.

I believe that I am stating an ascertained and incontestable fact when I say that Germany, Great Britain and the United States, beyond any other great powers, have been **at all significant times** dictated to, in matters of policy, by Jews, and predominantly by German Jews. Although, for instance, Lord Vansittart is most careful not to attribute German policy to Jewish control, the point that he makes, which is that there is no change in German policy during the past century; that it has been, and is consistent, amounts to saying that it has always been Jewish, because we know, beyond peradventure, that during the period in which it was most obvious, the period of Bismarck and Wilhelm II, it was moulded and organised by such men as Rathenau, Ballin, Bleichroeder and others, all Jews. It should be observed that there was during this period a facade of violent anti-Judaism in Germany of about the same effective value as that professed by the National Socialist Administration. Practically covering the whole of this period, the German-Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, was probably the most powerful single individual in Great Britain, and his opposite number and correspondent, Jacob Schiff, the patron of Presidents in America.

If anyone is naive enough to suppose that these people knew nothing of the underlying policy of each other, then I would ask him to consider the fact that the chief financial advisers at the Peace Conference in 1919, representing both the "victors" and the defeated, were all cousins, all Jews, and all connected with one German-Jew bank in New York.

As Premier Stalin said (and we had better take notice), "Hitlers come and Hitlers go, but the German people and the German State remain." He made it clear that he intended them to remain, more or less as they are.

It must surely be obvious that if you have a single effective control over three ostensibly independent nations, and in one of them you exalt militarism to the status of a religion, and in the other two you finance pacifism, together with adulation of the militarist nation (it sounds impossible, but it has been, and is being, done) you cannot conceivably have any primary policy but one. You desire war. Since war in itself is, to put it conservatively, disagreeable, you obviously do not intend to take part in it, but to use it to further conditions satisfactory to you.

If the Germans are to be credited with elementary intelligence, they must see that nothing could ensure the safety of the Jews so effectively in a European War as a ferocious display of anti-Semitism (I use this misused word advisedly in this instance). It immediately establishes the "persecuted" as non-combatants; it provides a mass of "refugees"—many of whom are perfect spies and propagandists, and it puts them in the well-known position of backing every horse in the race. I am completely agnostic as to the extent of genuine barbarity by Germans to Jews. Some of the atrocity stories, such as the use of Jewish babies as footballs, are merely idiotic. But even if I

were convinced that it is considerable in extent, my comment would be that it is not a tithe of the suffering endured by the fighting troops, and is an example of using an army, not without loss, but with a minimum of loss, and the minimum of risk of final defeat. I am convinced that the Jewish High Command desires the ultimate victory of Germany, and will fight tooth-and-nail, not to end the war, but to see that Germany is not defeated in the peace.

That, alone, is a sufficient reason for the complete defeat of Germany.

Since Great Britain is, and always has been, the great obstacle to the Big Idea, it is obvious that however much of the fighting is done by her, and however much (and the more the better) her loss and damage, she is to return, like the butler in Barrie's play *The Admirable Crichton*, to that self-effacing hush which is supposed to be becoming to the good. (Anyway, General Eisenhower won the North African campaign, didn't he!) The Armistice period is incomprehensible other than as a well arranged plan to emasculate and demoralise this country and its people.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I don't believe that in the consummation of the Great Plan, the Germans would fare very much better than anyone else. But it appears evident that the Germans are the ideal people to do the dirty work antecedent to the coming of the New Jerusalem, and are already "air-conditioned" to hand over the reins of power at a suitable moment.

X

In the sense in which the word Education, with a capital, is understood by the Headmasters' Conference, I should be the first to admit incompetence as a critic of it. But on the policy of education I do not feel so entirely unqualified. No reasonably observant individual with average geographical and social experience (which school-masters, and particularly elementary schoolmasters, generally lack) could fail in acquiring a deep sense of misgiving as to the results of "educational" policy over the past fifty years. First as to the facts. The word "educate" means "to lead out." Words are very important things—they are the only link we have in common between a fact and an idea. The first point to notice is that the underlying idea of the standard type of school is "to put in," not "to lead out." I do not think that the Public School emphasis on character provides an answer.

Demon est deus inversus.

The less important result of this is that, as Mr. Sorabji pointed out, only about five in every hundred acquire any profit either to themselves or anyone else by the process, and such faculties as the remainder possess are "blunted and stunted" by the system. Much more germane to the well-being of the social structure is the fact that this "putting-in" process is operative at an age when the critical faculty, even in the case of individuals who might later have developed it, is almost non-existent. In consequence, such ideas as are absorbed are accepted as equally factual—"twice two equals four," and "labour produces all wealth," being statements of the same importance and credibility.

It is safe to say that in varying degree all victims of this mental drill spend the second twenty years of life in dehypnotising themselves of the subconscious attitudes absorbed in the first twenty.

The complete pragmatic failure of the policy is demonstrated by Germany, which drove the cramming technique perhaps farther than any other country. And the final stage is now openly proclaimed by the National Socialists—that the end and aim of "education" is to mould every German into a slave of the State and a fanatical worshipper of its Führer.

It should be remembered that this system is highly modern. The oldest Public School in England (excluding one or two slightly romantic claims to existence in the Dark Ages) does not antedate the fifteenth century, and in those days Public Schools were public schools.

During the Middle Ages, in which the common life of these islands, bearing in mind the state of the industrial and domestic arts, was probably higher than it has been before or since, the child of well-established (not

necessarily rich) parents, spent his early years, after infancy, in the household of a great lord as a page. He was reasonably disciplined in behaviour, mixed with other pages and all social classes, and learnt to be useful, while observing the ways and success or otherwise of his elders. Later, he travelled, or went to the foreign wars (not a very dangerous field sport in those days), *and then*, if the urge was with him, visited the Universities and imbibed what he could from books. Notice the complete inversion of principle to which we have been led. Instead of, as in the Middle Ages, applying the experience of the present to a consideration and criticism of the *records* (not the facts) of the past, we make the records (not the facts) of both the present and the past a standard against which to assess experience undergone "with blunted and stunted" faculties. Could any more Satanic method be devised of hindering the human individual from profiting by experience than to ensure that he is incapable of applying any unwarped intelligence to it!

Let anyone who imagines that this picture is overdrawn talk to the average mechanic between the ages of twenty and thirty on the subject of Russia. A handful of enthusiasts for so-called Russian Communism have, in the past decade, gone to Russia to work.

I am not aware of one single instance in which, where return was possible, the verdict was not wholly condemnatory, and to the effect that conditions might suit the Russians for the moment, but they would never be tolerated here. I met Max Eastman, the fanatical Russian-Socialist enthusiast, twenty years ago, when he was convinced that Russia was the coming Paradise. There is no more bitter critic of the Soviet system alive.

A short time ago a technically trained Soviet woman engineer was taken round this country as a kind of seventh-day wonder of Russian progress. A British woman engineer of long experience, rather bored by the naïveté of the exhibit, enquired as to the whereabouts of several Russian University women she had known who were over here in the days of Imperial Russia to add to their engineering experience. The enquiry was considered to be in the worst of taste.

None of this kind of thing, and not even the reports of Trades Union delegations, have the slightest effect on the readers of the lamented *Daily Worker* whatever may be the private opinions of those who read its threepenny edition. The effect of so-called universal education is to condition the average mind for the reception and retention, in the face of reason and experience, of any myth which seems to connect with some cliché absorbed before leaving school. Anyone who desires unbiassed information on Russia from a Russian should refer to an article by M. Paul Haensel in *Contemporary Russia* for May, 1937.

I am satisfied that nothing will right this situation but a complete reversion, under modern conditions, to the earlier sequence. After a lengthy but not isolated childhood, the simple elements mentioned by Mr. Sorabji, of reading, writing, and the simplest arithmetic (can anything be more idiotic than to teach the average child the extraction of cube roots?) and an *"au pair"* system, or its school equivalent, should be arranged which would diversify social experience at a fairly early age, to be followed by short hours in economic life of some description. At about the beginning of the twenties, work overseas should be undertaken and three or four years afterwards, entrance to a University should be encouraged.

The inculcation of social or industrial theories at an early age should be discouraged by every means available. *Deus est demon inversus.*

XI

About four years before the outbreak of the second world war, seven broadcasts on "The Causes of War" were delivered from London, one of which it was my fate to give.

The seven broadcasts were summed up by Sir Austen Chamberlain. Each of the broadcasters emphasised a different cause, but all, together with Sir Austen, some by implication and others in so many words, agreed unanimously on one thing. Major Douglas was wholly wrong. War was a very complex thing, and the more causes you gave, the more likely you were to be right. I notice that none of the complex causes have received any attention since the broadcasts, but that energetic action was taken on the first day of war to institute measures which would make war as attractive as possible to large numbers of people who would have preferred

peace, but not the kind of peace they were getting. The measures bear, I think, a recognisable relationship to the matter of the derided broadcast.

I suppose that about two thousand millions of individuals are affected by the present war. I should place the number of individuals who would be quite unable to say with approximate accuracy what it is about at roughly nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions, so that we are left with this simple alternative. Either the total population of the world likes war without knowing what it is about; in which case it is obviously absurd to do anything to abolish it, or, on the other hand, we can find the causes of war if we examine the actions of a minority hidden amongst less than a million individuals.

It appears to me (but, of course, I may be wrong) to be elementary and incontestable that it wouldn't really matter much what this minority did or thought, if they were not in control of mechanisms which enabled them to force the other nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions to take part in a war they didn't understand and didn't want. If I am not wrong in this, it appears equally incontestable, that you can prevent war amongst the nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions if you destroy the power of the small minority over them.

For my own part, there is no spectacle I should applaud more heartily than the outbreak of war amongst the minority, and I should do everything to see that it lasted as long as possible and broke out again with the shortest possible intervals. Now it is equally incontestable that every effort possible is being made to increase, and, in fact, render impregnable, the power of this minority over the majority.

Unless there is some flaw in the argument which has escaped me, war is even more certain and more certain to be universal and devastating, as a result of this increased concentration of control, than it was in 1939. Fascism and Bolshevism only enter into it as the two parties enter into a Parliamentary contest. As Lionel Gerber says in his book, *Peace by Power*, "Power never vanishes. If you do not wish to retain or wield it, somebody else will. You may feel the effects of power as a passive recipient; you may deal with it as an active agent. There is no escape, no immunity—none so far above the battle that by it he, too, is untouched."

And, to interpolate one word into Lord Acton's famous observation, "All (delegated) power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." To which the Chatham House gang would no doubt reply, "So what?"

Really, this matter is quite simple if we can convalesce to even a moderate extent from our "education." It is not necessary to rely upon such statements as that of M. Francois Coty, as proceeding from Walter Rathenau, that "the world is governed by less than four hundred men, every one of whom knows all the others." Such a statement has its value, because it suggests a source from which to obtain the names of the specific four hundred. But the general fact is observable by anyone. Take the "fetich of efficiency," to give it a technical name, and put it alongside "the problem of full employment," to give that another. Take the "peace comes from Law backed by overwhelming force" racket, and put it alongside our declaration of war to preserve the sovereignty of Poland. Take the statement of the Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chatham House"), Dr. Arnold Toynbee, at Copenhagen in 1931, that "we are working discreetly but with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations," and consider that this egregious collection of pink intriguers was carefully evacuated to Oxford at the beginning of the war, and its staff is being paid by the British public, which is spending fourteen million pounds a day and has already had a million casualties to preserve that sovereignty which Dr. Toynbee boasted of attempts to destroy.

Consider the statements of such publicists as Mr. Douglas Reed that their despatches warning the British public that Germany was feverishly re-arming were consistently suppressed. Consider the amazing fact that, not only did the Maginot Line terminate "in the air," but the hastily fortified line from its termination to the sea was held by the worst quality troops, with the worst officers, in the French Army. Consider the newspaper control which is almost openly admitted, and the ownership of the main news-agencies without which no newspaper can function.

Consider that "class differences," *as distinct from cultural differences*, are almost solely a question of money, yet official Socialism and Communism, which the international Press of every country advertise and favour in every way, never attack bankers or the money ring, or question the credit system. Consider Viscount Snowden,

Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer, the darling of the "City," a soured exponent of an inferiority complex if ever there was one, and his ecstatic remark that "The Bank of England is the greatest moral force in the world" (God help us!).

These are evidences of the forces which have been dominant in the past. Is anyone simple enough to suppose that they are all ranged on the side of Fascism, or Bolshevism? Or that the elimination of one of these modern names for the Liberal and the Conservative would destroy the controllers of the other? Consider the German Herr Menne: "The large-scale industrialists had two powerful allies on their side, two surprisingly dissimilar allies—the Kaiser and the German Socialists."

XII

There is probably no more infallible key to a policy than to analyse its Myth, and no surer indication of its source than to trace its channels of publicity and propagation to their origin. Obviously, we must, in order to achieve this end, know beyond peradventure the nature and properties of a myth.

Like so many other words in common use, it has become to many people something which its derivation, the Greek word *mythos*, does not justify. The word simply means a story—not an untrue story, or a "true" story, but just a story. The distinction is highly important, because the nature of the myth and the use to which it is put go down to one of the great mysteries of the universe.

Although the root ideas of idealistic philosophies such as Christian Science are all enshrined in Virgil's *Aeneid*, I think it was Prentice Mulford, the inspirer of the New Thought movement, who first used the phrase "Thoughts are things." To what extent that is an accurate statement may be open to doubt, but there is no doubt whatever that under certain conditions, thoughts **becomethings**. The literal truth of this was strikingly illustrated in the well known "miracle of the Salpêtrière" in which a patient in that famous French mental hospital, who was afflicted with acute religious mania, and imagined himself to be the Christ, developed the marks of the nails and spear on his feet, hands and side. Obviously, the delusion was not "true," but the *belief* was both real and effective.

Now High Politics and Priestcraft were once openly identified, and it is certain that in technique they have never been divorced except in appearance. Recent pro-nouncements by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as those of his predecessor, have the authentic ring of contempt for the masses, and the belief in the necessity of providing them with a myth.

There are, of course, a large number of High Political myths which can be seen to have dominated history. There is the Holy Grail, the Crusading myth, Joan of Arc's voices, the Money myth, the blessedness-of-poverty myth, with its corollary that the many are virtuous while the few are wicked, so that if you make everyone poor, you make every-one good; the Problem of Employment myth, and many others.

But I have no doubt whatever that the Chosen Race myth, with its corollary of Messianism, is the key myth of history, and that in it we can find almost a complete explanation of the world's insanity (e.g., divorce from reality); and an almost complete indication of the path to recovery. Those are large statements. It is only possible to look at certain of the many contemporary proofs of them.

Now it must be obvious that when a myth attains the immense power which comes from belief by large numbers of people over a long period of time, it ceases to be the possession of its originators, and in fact becomes far stronger than they are. It is for this reason that I believe that the so-called Old Testament, with its claims in regard to an obscure and turbulent tribe, most probably of very mixed blood, is the matrix of contemporary Germany. There is not a single feature of National Socialism which is not Judaic, from the *Herrenvolk* idea to the Sacred State under the Hitlerian Messiah. And the observable fact that half the world is fighting the other half, while, behind the gladiators, all the features of the Judaic Civitas Dei are being quietly introduced under the plea of military necessity, is simply a measure of its extent.

I suppose no-one is naive enough to believe that the claim to be Chosen People is now either the sole possession of the Jews or the Germans. Read Nicholas Murray Butler's *Age of the Americas*. Or consider the title of an article in an American magazine: *America: a World Idea*. There is, in fact, an American myth; and the world had better appreciate that fact. It is profoundly significant that while the Jew and the German claim to supremacy is based on race, the American claim is based on exactly the opposite ground—that "race" is nonsense. Yet the U.S.A. is politically Jewish.

I suggested that it was not of the essence of a myth that it should be "true." Yet I think and hope that there is a real difference between a "true" myth and a "political" myth and that the test of this difference is simply whether belief in it is self sustaining, or whether it requires organised maintenance. And there are many instances of the myth which was once approximately true, but no longer corresponds to fact, and yet is kept in circulation by a conscious effort of organisation because of its usefulness to the organisers. The identification of democracy with parliamentary suffrage is such a myth.

Originally, and quite possibly until the passing of the Reform Bill, it had a factual basis. Voting, as a mechanism for deciding action, arose from the eminently sensible idea that if God was on the side of the largest number, instead of proving it by bloody battles, you would achieve the same result by counting noses. It will be noticed that the argument is not on a high intellectual level, and assumes that each voter would, in the last resort, have the same length of spear, or throw the same weight of rock.

In the so-called democratic countries ballot-box suffrage is nearly universal, and the more nearly universal it is, the more we are driven to ponder on the nature of the God who, as indicated by this process, is on the side of the big battalions. The fact, of course, is that a parliamentary vote gives no effective control, and the more widespread the vote, the less the control. Obviously if you "nationalise" every-thing, you remove everything from identifiable and responsible control, and place it under unidentified and irresponsible control.

And yet there is an increasing number of well-meaning people who are clamouring for the nationalisation of the banks, without even going to the trouble of finding out who controls the Bank of "England." Which brings us to the British Israel and "Pyramid" myth.

XIII

If I have conveyed my conception of the nature and powers of the myth with any success, it will be clear that a wide distance separates disbelief in such matters as "British Israel Truth," "Pyramidology," and Dr. Grattan Guinness's views on the Book of Daniel, from the assumption that it is a matter of no importance that millions of people do believe them. So far as the veridical aspect of these "theories," or whatever one likes to call them, is concerned, the fundamental proposition they involve is, to put it mildly, comprehensive.

If the people who designed and built the pyramids five thousand years ago knew that there would be a war in A.D. 1914, then obviously nothing could be done to stop it, and our political efforts are, and always have been, a waste of time. This inference is of importance when we come to consider a second theory—that the object of all these movements is to paralyse action against revolution.

So far as the Book of Daniel is concerned, Porphyry, and since him many others, have regarded the whole work as a fabrication of a Palestinian Jew who lived in the time of Antiochus, and have concluded that its express purpose was to bolster up the "Chosen Race" idea.

If we are to take the authenticity aspect seriously, this criticism has a considerable bearing on the British Israel cult, since the Stone Kingdom supposed to be Britain is that mentioned in the Book of Daniel.

It may be said at once that there can be no doubt that these Pyramid myths have a Masonic origin, although it is not publicised. I have previously referred to the appearance of the pyramid on the Great Seal of the U.S.A. Many people will remember the appearance of full page pyramid diagrams accompanied by prophesies, in several of the London daily papers a few years ago. Apart from the money cost of them, at advertisement rates, which

represented at least £20,000, it is improbable that the newspapers in which they appeared would, in the ordinary way, accept matter of this character. I have been informed on good authority that the publicity was arranged, and paid for, by the New York B'nai Brith, the Jewish Masonic Society. Whether it was so paid for or not, the prevalence of this propaganda, the vogue of astrology, and the appearance of organisations calling themselves World Servers and similar high-sounding names, all of them insisting that they are the heralds of a New Order, are too reminiscent of the French and Russian Revolutions to be accidental, and I do not believe that the newspapers in question were unaware of it.

But the profoundly significant fact is that certain momentous happenings do correspond with these prophetic dates, *and we know that they were consciously timed to correspond.*

For instance, the "great economic blizzard" (notice the suggestion that it was a phenomenon of nature) struck the world in 1929, and if ever there was a conscious and deliberately produced catastrophe it was the five-year depression. And May, 1928 was one of the Pyramid dates. On the day predicted for a momentous event, the Act of Parliament handing the British Currency over to the Bank of "England" became law. There are other instances known to me, and I am satisfied that the dates were consciously arranged. I was informed in 1920, from a source closely approximating to that which initiated the "blizzard," that it would occur about 1928.

Viewed in the light of subsequent events, the Currency Act of 1928 can be seen, and I think can only be seen, as a conscious preparation for an arranged depression, together with the best possible defence against any interference with the depression by relieving its cause. It is a damning piece of evidence which ought to hang its perpetrators even yet.

For obvious reasons I refrain from enlarging on the anticipatory emphasis placed on King Edward VIII, "exactly one hundred generations from King David" and known in the family circle as David.

August, 1938, was to be the date of the outbreak of war culminating in Armageddon. *And it would have been, if it had not been for the efforts of Mr. Chamberlain*, who was apparently stronger than the pyramid. There is nothing in all history more astounding than the contrast, on the one hand, of the relief both in England and Germany at the subsequently abortive compromise of Munich, and the hysterical rage at it of the American Press—notably the same Press which fought tooth and nail to keep the U.S.A. out of the war, but which has now turned its attention to making sure that once-Great Britain loses the Peace.

Mark the Editorial views of a widely read "*American*" review:—

"Among international agencies of a more political character which ought to be functioning now, or all ready to function, might be mentioned:

"A colonial administration to act as receiver for defunct colonial empires (it would be folly to try to return the East Indies to Britain (**sic**) and the Netherlands).

"A European Federal Judicial system, perhaps under the World Court, to try cases of war criminals and to lay down standards for adjudicating the tangled property rights left over from the war.

"A European Police Force, or International Army." Compare this with the views of Dr. Arnold Toynbee.

It should not escape notice that these "prophetic" theories, whether pyramidologist, "lost ten Tribes" or interpretations of the prophet Daniel, came into currency much about the same time, i.e., just after the Franco-Prussian War, which was the event marking the emergence of the "United States of Europe" policy of Freemasonry, sponsored by Frederick the "Great" and pursued by Bismarck and Hitler.

The pyramidologists refer to the final chamber of the Pyramid, which marks the "end of the age," as the Hall of the Grand Orient.

It may be objected that the inference is pro-British. To which the answer is that just to the extent that these myths are a factor in policy (certain British Ministers, Mr. Baldwin's 'white-haired boys,' resigned at the time of

Munich, and rushed off to New York for further instructions) they are firstly, pro-war, and finally pro-German-American-Jew, since they all hint at the Federal Union of the British Empire and the U.S.A.—a Union in which the British Empire would disappear in a slave world ruled by Jews, including, no doubt, a few German-British Jews.

The accessible officials of the organisations propagating the British-American myth are probably sincere, and are of minor importance. Who is behind them?

XIV

Let us try to draw the threads of the long story (a story which, to be understood, must be considered over periods involving thousands of years) into a tapestry.

A Chosen People *is a collectivity bound together by a myth, and the less intelligent the individual the more likely he is to be the slave of a myth.* The Jews, for instance, are not in the main intelligent. No body of individuals which was intelligent would have repeated its mistakes as the Jews have repeated, and are repeating theirs. An in-bred race is peculiarly susceptible to hypnotism, i.e., domination by a myth.

The relation of an individual to a myth is important, and is well illustrated by Hans Andersen's charming little fable of the King who had no clothes on. The conventions and laws which grow up round, and buttress, a myth may persist, in the manner in which the sanctions of the money myth persist, but they are in mortal danger when a child sees through them, and says so. "Nothing is so dangerous as initiative."

If we substitute the word "ruling" for "chosen," and realise that various peoples, including our own, have presented a facade of being the "ruling" race for just so long as they have been the passive tools of the money power, it is not difficult to see that, once the myth gets out of hand, wars and yet more wars are inevitable. After draining and pillaging one country after another, the international money power, the wandering Jew, has in the past left bemused or subsidised historians to explain that, like the rise and fall of the Roman Empire (almost completely a monetary phenomenon due to "silver inflation"), all nations have their day, and that prosperity is bad for them. Several children have seen through this story, with the result that old contestants for the limelight are unwilling to retire into the wings and a virtuous poverty. We have only to compare the remark of General Ludendorff, which I have quoted elsewhere, that "The majority of the English do not realise that, having done their duty by the inner Jewish circle, they have now got to disappear as a world Power" (—*The Coming War*, 1931) with that of Mr. Winston Churchill, which has been so coldly received in America, "I did not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire," to see that the meek acceptance of the decrees of fate is somewhat marred by the realisation that fate is a lady of easy virtue, always to be found and acquired where the pickings are good.

There is a technique well known to politicians, lawyers and jugglers which consists in emphasising the unimportant while you slip in the essential. It is much in evidence just now. If you can get up a furious debate as to whether income tax shall be 10/- or 15/- after the war, you stand a fair chance of drowning the small, but rapidly increasing, number of people who say that taxation is robbery. If you can become really excited about whether the unit of world currency shall be called a bancor or a unitas (United States) or a shekel, you will be less likely to enquire whether the creation of the means of payment out of nothing has been so striking a success when administered more or less locally that the immense urgency of removing this myth incarnate to a point in space where its administrators will be even more shrouded in mystery, and immune from the consequences of financing Hitler's successor, is sufficiently demonstrated, except to the Chosen. And you may, once again, be driven to wonder why it is that, if an individual finds that a device does not work satisfactorily, he modifies it before extending its use, but if a Government finds a device is demonstrably defective, it connives at its enthronement as a world principle.

Precisely at this point the contribution of the province of Alberta to world history and genuine progress can be seen. Mr. Aberhart's Government has demonstrated, by forcing the nominees of the Money Power to disallow his legislation, that "economic determinism" is a mechanism of political intention. The Money Power does not, and never did wish to improve the money system—its consequences in war, sabotage and social friction are

exactly what is desired. This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve, or perish. **First**, to attack and defeat the **Money Power**; **then** consider the reorganisation of the money *system*.

All these things, and many more, have convinced me that one of the fundamentals of genuine Christianity is that the only true focus of power is the individual, which is simply a matter-of-fact method of affirming the Immanence of God over the Monotheistic Jehovah. The conscious man is not born to be ruled, neither is he born to rule over other people. Jesus said so, and the Jews crucified Him. They could do no other. I believe we shall be taking the most generally accurate view of history for at least the past two thousand years if we view it as a conscious attempt on the one side, and an unconscious reaction on the other side, to and from the separation of the individual and his natural attributes, and to vest them in organisations controlled by power maniacs. If you prefer to say that it is a struggle to separate man from God, to replace the immanence of God (i.e., power over events) by the Omnipotent Jehovah (i.e., subservience to events), I shall not quarrel with your choice of words, although it is the practical use you can make of them which matters. I have spent some of my life on, or beyond, the fringes of "civilisation," where men carried guns, and used them without hesitation. The social atmosphere of those districts was much better than that of policed areas. It is not in the wilds that the scum of the earth rises; it is in the towns.

The denial of the right of the individual to carry arms is a fundamental infringement of liberty. Just as the bootlegger was the most enthusiastic supporter of prohibition, the gangster, both national and international, is a convinced adherent of disarmament by law. He knows what to do about the law, and what every policeman wants. And when, the smaller gangsters having disarmed the individual, the larger gangsters disarm the smaller gangsters, then, of course, the gangsters who are left will be transformed into ministering angels, and their international police will spend all their time helping international nursemaids to cross the international traffic. Anyone can see that.

XV

Through the courtesy of a correspondent, I have received an extract from an article by Mr. Harold Laski which was published in *The New Statesman* of June 5, 1943.

So far as my mental digestion will permit, I endeavour to read the views of people with whom I disagree. But my position in regard to the weekly journal in question is that of the deaf old lady whose nephew wished to introduce his friend Schnozzlewitt to her. After many efforts, with and without her trumpet, the old lady said sadly, "It's no good, Johnny; I'm getting deafer every day. It just sounds like Schnozzlewitt to me."

I gather that the article is entitled "*1848 and Ourselves*" and the extract I have received is as follows:—
". . . The main issue the Left has to decide is when it will co-ordinate its forces for the victory that is its historic right. It can build forthwith a full understanding with the leaders of the Soviet Union and its people; in that event it gives to the revolution a creative power against which the forces of reaction will hurl themselves in vain. Or it can wait to make its treaty of friendship until the gangsters of Berlin, Rome and Tokyo are finally overwhelmed. In that event the Left accepts the risk of losing the favourable moment and giving its enemies the chance of consolidating their strength anew. . . . If in the light of an experience so massive" (that is, from the 1848 revolutions, the reasons for the failure of which Laski had explained) "our leaders do not act while there is still time, we can be sure only of two things; there will be a third world war in our own generation, and the Left will find new leaders more apt to its opportunity. . . . This is the one moment in time when Man the Rebel could become Man the Creator. To let that moment pass unused is a betrayal that will never be forgiven by posterity."

For the reason I have indicated, I am unable to state what further pearls of wisdom Professor Laski has embodied on this occasion, but both the title and the quotation are perhaps worth attention, not so much as news, but as exhibits.

Until recently, most Jews have repudiated any historic continuity in revolution, and any specific relationship between Jews, as such, and the French, German, and Russian Revolutions. Professor Laski appears to have discarded this attitude. "The Left" has an "historic right" to "victory." "It" can do thus and such, "concluding

arrangements with Foreign Powers," and the result will be this and that. We have the familiar suggestion of an intangible collectivity which will have its way "in war, or under threat of war."

To understand how it is possible for a Professor of Political Economy in an English University to write in the style of a Hyde Park ranter, it is, I think, necessary to realise his background and its implications.

Professor Laski is a Manchester Jew, I should imagine of the third generation, although of this I am not sure. Three generations would take us back to the revolutions of 1848 to which he refers, and it is probable that the arrival in this country of his progenitors was not unconnected with the failure he laments.

Now, Manchester has a very important place in English, and indeed world, history. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was the focus of probably the largest body of rich and for this reason powerful Jews not merely in Great Britain, but anywhere outside Holland and Germany. It was also, whether by coincidence or not, the focus both of the industrial revolution, the factory or Gentile Ghetto, and of labour rioting, of which Peterloo is the best remembered incident. While its slums, as Mr. Austin Hopkinson has pointed out, were perhaps the worst in the country, its better suburbs, such as Cheetham Hill and the nearby fringe of Cheshire, were dominated by mansions amongst the owners of which it was difficult to find an English name, and easier to be understood in German or Yiddish than in the local tongue. Contemporaneously, the "Manchester School" (Free Trade, Ricardian Economics, the Iron Law of Wages, etc.) dominated English politics, and Sir Robert Peel, himself a manufacturer, on the one hand sponsored the repeal of the Corn Laws, thus inaugurating the decay of British agriculture, and on the other introduced for the first time in these islands, the police system.

In 1844 the Bank Charter Act centralised credit in the Bank of "England" (even at that date it is impossible to identify the ownership of it) and based credit on gold, the main holders of gold being, of course, the Rothschilds, with their bullion brokers, the Samuels. The similarity between the strategy of the Bank Charter Act of 1844 in relation to the wave of revolution in 1848, and the Bank Notes and Currency Act of 1928 in relation to the "economic blizzard" of 1929, is too obvious to require more than mention.

Meanwhile, the physical aspect of the Manchester district, from the slopes of Lyme on the South, on which the fallow deer had grazed for a thousand years, to "proud Preston" fifty miles North, was transformed from a region of outstanding beauty and agricultural fertility to a desolation of black coal refuse, foetid streams, and ugly, endless rows of gloomy tenements, miscalled cottages. No war ever devastated a smiling countryside so thoroughly and for so long as the textile industries and their ancillary trades devastated south Lancashire. The spinning jenny and the power loom are the original mould of mass production (production with the soul taken out of it) and for some reason which is difficult to explain, the Jew has always been attracted to the finance of mass production, especially of clothes and clothing materials.

The internal effect of this was to drive the agricultural population into the towns, to shift the political balance of power to the manufacturer-exporter (thus elevating the Bill of Exchange to the position of a major political weapon) and to re-orientate completely the economic policy of the country from autarky to mercantilism. Most of the great fortunes amassed in Manchester in the nineteenth century, apart from purely financial manipulation, were "made" in dark little offices employing half a dozen clerks at starvation wages, by German and other Jews who never even saw the materials, other than as "samples," in which they were dealing, and whose function was to separate the maker and the user.

Against this state of affairs there was, in essence, only one defence—the Tory Party.

Under a facade of what is now called Tory democracy, men such as Lord George Bentinck paved the way to the long leadership of Benjamin Disraeli. It is sufficient to say that the Tory Party not only failed to secure a revival of agriculture but succeeded in establishing itself firmly in the minds of the general public as the party of reaction, high taxes, dear food, and war.

It would take us too far from Professor Laski to trace the influence of "Manchester" on the amazing Crimean War against Imperial Russia—the beginning of the attack which terminated in the murders of the Bolshevik Revolution—, on the American Civil War and its relation to Egypt, and on every major feature of nineteenth century policy. England became the head office of every plotter in Europe—and "Manchester" provided a great

deal of the funds they required. The point I am concerned to make at this time is simply this—that probably at no time in history has a body of immigrants come into an established country and obtained so much power and so effectively dispossessed the natives, as did the Jews in England between the time of William of Orange and the emergence of Joseph Chamberlain as a tariff reformer. In that situation, "Manchester" was central. And it is profoundly important to enquire why there appears to be something which leads Professor Laski to fear that the "victory which is its historic right" is being filched from what we will agree with him to call "the Left."

Before passing to this, we may note the fact that Manchester's leading newspaper probably had a larger circulation amongst the "Left" in every country, and particularly in the United States, than any similar periodical, and that the sedulously-propagated idea that "What Manchester thinks to-day, the world will think to-morrow" was taken with surprising seriousness by its admirers.

XVI

The statement made in many quarters that one nation after another comes into the grip of, and is used by, the Jews reasonably provokes the comment:—"Well, if the Jews are so superhumanly clever that no one seems able to stand against them, there is nothing to be done about it. They win." This is, no doubt, what Professor Laski means when he states that "the Left" has "an historic right" to victory. It may also be noticed that a claim is implicit in this either that "the Left" is invariably right, or alternatively, it doesn't matter whether "it" is right or not.

There are several issues involved in this aspect of the matter. The first is "How has it been done?" The answer to this enquiry is "Simply, and in the last resort, solely, by control of the credit system." The God of this World is Money, and his Chosen People are the Jews.

Every effort has been made to present the Jew as primarily a usurer. I doubt whether the Jew was ever primarily a usurer. He has been in possession of a technique of credit-money creation for thousands of years, and his power has come not so much from charging interest as from creating new claims and appropriating them. This technique probably came via Egypt from Chaldea. There is, I believe, in existence somewhere a baked Chaldean tile which has inscribed on it an almost perfect prototype of the modern Bill of Exchange—the basic document of international finance.

Once understood, and it is not really very difficult to understand, only quite moderate intelligence is necessary to operate the credit system. And, operated with attention to a few easily formulated rules, banking automatically comes into control of everything necessary for its own defence, including control of information. Just so long as it is not widely understood.

That the power of the Jew is primarily the power of the banker, is certain. That fact is both a complete answer to the defeatist, and a clear indication of the direction in which to look for the triumph of the Right. But it does not deal with certain other aspects of the problem.

If you say that a man is a European, there is a sense in which you are just using words. You do not describe an Austrian in a company of Englishmen by calling him a European. But in a camp of Hottentots the appellation conveys a distinct and realistic picture.

The Jew is, in this sense, an Oriental, and only Europeans who have had contact with the Oriental mind acquire sufficient wisdom to realise that they only very partially understand its workings, and that it works differently from the mind of any European. Consequently, to contend with it on its own ground is to court disaster.

To take a simple example, the average Englishman, with careful coaching and lengthy preparation, can secure a reasonable place in the Honours Examination in his chosen subject at one of our older Universities. While there is not lacking a body of respectable opinion to the effect that examinations prove little or nothing, it does seem to be the case that the average Honours Graduate is at least averagely successful in later life. But the Oriental, with one tenth the preparation, will leave him standing in almost any written examination which you can devise,

and still be completely useless for any practical purpose. I personally knew an Indian who took a high place in **Three** Triposes, and was only prevented from taking a fourth by the veto of the authorities. He was a pleasant but incompetent individual, and so far as I am aware has never done anything of the slightest consequence since he was restrained from rendering the Examination system ridiculous.

Such ideas as "fairness," "decency" and what we call the realistic Christian virtues, convey nothing to the Oriental *as such*. Perhaps I might with advantage observe at this juncture that many Orientals compare very favourably with many Europeans on every ground. That does not invalidate the main contention, which is that the Oriental has virtues of his own, but they are not in the main the same virtues as those of the European, and they do not contact them.

Again, for example, the "Liberal" ideas of the mid—nineteenth century, such as "England, the asylum of the politically oppressed," appear to the Eastern mind as either an invitation to corruption, feebleness, or insanity, and as such to be exploited to the possible limit. The only sense in which any gratitude ought to be expected, or is given, is that of a lively sense of favours to come. If the relationship between Great Britain and India had no other value, and it has many, the fact that it has injected into the Indian consciousness, more particularly in the North-West, the idea of "character" (a completely alien idea to the East) and into a few British minds the fatuousness of forcing political systems on to peoples whose philosophies do not fit them, would have justified it.

Perhaps the cleavage in outlook between the East and West is most practically exemplified in the idea of "price" as simply the haggling of the market, or as Sir Marcus Samuel put it, "the price of an article is what it will fetch," on the one hand, and the struggles of the Mediaeval Church (the foundation of Europeanism) with the concept of the Just Price. Whether St. Thomas Aquinas achieved any stable mechanism for this doctrine, I do not know—probably not. But the philosophy of it is basic. There is no part of the Social Credit thesis which has roused such rancour as the demonstration that the Just, or what we now prefer to call the Compensated Price, is at the root of economic democracy.

Professor Laski knows quite well that the compensated price is now an integral part of British official policy, and he knows equally well that the money system is widely understood.

I think that it is in these facts that we can find the explanation of the rather urgent call for hurry. Things are not what they were. "Man, the Rebel" becomes the pet of the bullion-broker, and "Man, the Creator" the indispensable raw material of full employment at maintenance wages or slightly below. In fact, to quote Mr. Sieff, in a 1931 edition of *Freedom and Planning*, "The only rival [?] world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics." It may be noticed that none of the enthusiasts for Soviet Russia can be persuaded to go and live there.

XVII

While there may be room for much difference of opinion as to the factors which go to make up social direction, I do not think any competent observer can dispute one of them. It is simplicity itself. **If war, and particularly modern mechanised war, is inherent in society, then all society must take organisation for war as its primary objective, and that implies a slave state.**

I do not propose to discuss this proposition at length because anyone can see for himself not only that individual interests are swept into a functional policy of "everything for the war effort" but also that "the surrender of our freedom" is taken to be axiomatically inherent in **success** in war, so that we can say that the shortest way to enslave a society is—"only in war, or under threat of war."

At this point, a short digression on the fashionable phrase "over-simplification" seems to be desirable. It may be noticed that all really respectable comment on matters of moment is at some pains to disclaim anything of this nature, and the more complex the comment, the more certain is it to be accredited as respectable. When the explanation of any phenomenon is so complex, and takes so many factors into consideration that no one of them,

if subjected to modification, can be expected to produce much alteration, it can be predicted with some certainty that it will be commended as a solid contribution to the solution of world problems.

All problems are, however, just as complex as you care to make them. Let us suppose that you wish to explain the light by which you are reading. You may say that it proceeds from a heated wire enclosed in a glass bulb, which could not operate without thus and such arrangements of rubber-covered wires. Someone is sure to say that the rubber shortage will inevitably threaten your lighting system. When the supply of power from the grid fails, a considerable body of opinion will blame the Japanese invasion of Malaya and the shortage of rubber. But if you say that your light proceeds from the transformation of one kind of energy into a different manifestation of the same energy, you are not only more generally accurate, but you set up a more useful train of thought, and cut out many irrelevancies. In general, a cause is more likely to be comprehensively identified if you consider it a long way back from its effect, and the attribution of an effect to a complexity of causes is, *a priori*, a suggestion of a shallow analysis. It may not be, but in relation to public policy, it generally is so. Or to put the matter another way, a political effect rarely has only one immediate derivation, but it generally has one primary cause.

Bearing this in mind, it is true to say that the cause of war is economic—that men do not want to fight but they will fight if they believe that otherwise they will starve, just as it is indisputable that revolution always relies on a promise of economic betterment, although it rarely or never fulfils that promise. But exactly at this point, we come to what may be a newly identified factor in world history. We have evidence of two major revelations.

The first of these is that the accepted idea that the poor are poor because the rich are rich has no foundation in fact and therefore class *economic* war has no factual justification. Poverty amidst plenty was not, and quite possibly never has been, due to the circumstance that supplies were inevitably limited, and only some could get enough.

And the second revelation, the final proof of which we owe to the Social Credit Government of the Canadian Province of Alberta, **is that there is an organisation consciously determined at any cost, of war or revolution, to uphold the economic war (of which military war is only one phase) and to use it as a weapon in the cultural war.** That is why Mr. McKenzie King, the Federal Prime Minister of Canada, disallowed Bills which, if translated into Acts, would have demonstrated that the economic standard of the poorest can be raised without impinging on the economic standard of the richest.

Now we are perhaps able to see to where this revelation is going to lead us. Is there a traceable link between the power which disallowed the Alberta legislation, financed Hitler, emasculated British military power, and ushered in the Second World War with a determined attempt to turn Great Britain overnight into a State Capitalist undertaking with an unknown board of Directors? We have beyond peradventure to find out, and if it exists, to identify it.

And this information has to be obtained, and the individuals have to be identified in the spirit, not of propaganda, but of a judicial trial which will be followed by a sentence. That trial, if its impartiality could be assured, would desirably be an official trial. But the Riom Trials were intended to be that kind of enquiry, and we know what happened to them. So it may have to be a trial organised outside the usual legal structure. If the responsible individuals during the years 1915-1940 are identified and punished, we may avoid a Third World War. If not, we shall have a Fourth and Fifth.

XVIII

Before there is a *prima facie* case for a trial there must be evidence of a crime.

What is the crime against civilisation whose commission requires the identification and punishment of its perpetrators? A satisfactory answer to this enquiry is not quite so simple as it might appear at first sight, and is certainly not comprised in the type of phrase always current in time of war, as, for instance "Hang the Kaiser"; "It's that man, Hitler. "

The first axiom, and I think it is a genuine axiom, of responsibility is contained in the Latin tag *Quia fecit per aliam, fecit per se*—**He who does it through another, does it himself**. Primary intention is the essence of crime. There is, of course, the accessory before and after the fact. But remove the planner, the instigator, and there will be no crime.

This is the background against which the fact, or other-wise, of a continuous policy in relation to which wars, economic friction, poverty amidst plenty, and the other too familiar features of our contemporary world must be judged. If it is true that these insanities simply proceed from sheer inability to understand how they can be eliminated, i.e., pure incompetence, then not only is no one to "blame," but, what is much more to the point, nothing will be gained by punishing anyone. This "village idiot" theory of events is steadily publicised. I think it is the failure to grasp the necessity for an antecedent decision on this point which is the cause of the extraordinary divergence of opinion as to what ought to be the type of peace imposed by the victors in the present military incident. There is not much doubt as to the type of peace which would be imposed if Great Britain lost the war, because there is no mental confusion in the minds of the rulers of Germany as to the existence of a continuous policy.

Now there is one unchanging feature of every social, economic, and military conflict of the last two thousand years at least. Governmental systems may change, kings may be replaced by presidents or dictators, feudal customs may give way to oligarchies or soviets. Through them all runs the dual thread of money and prices.

Yet this purely artificial, and fundamentally helpful, system has been the target of attack throughout the ages. Not once, but many times, men have risen to denounce the evils which they have traced to its perverted use. And all of these men, so far as I am aware, have come to the same conclusion. The evils which have arisen from a defective use of the credit system are without exception due to the use of it as an instrument of policy and not as an accounting and distributive system. This is the financial embodiment of the basic cleavage between Socialism and Social Credit, between Judaism and Christianity. No one with any knowledge of the question ever said, "Money is the root of all evil"; but the greatest have said, "The love of money is the root of all evil."

Money has been defined, and correctly from certain aspects, as a licence to act. To the extent that it is an exclusive licence to act, which is broadly true of large undertakings involving the activities of considerable numbers of men without comprehensive knowledge of the tendency of their combined action, it is permissible to make three statements:

(I) Conscious policy and large-scale finance are concentric.

(II) International Finance must traverse national interests. It is a licence issued to a citizen of A to initiate action on the part of a citizen of B irrespective of the interest of B and without the citizen of B having an opportunity to express his opinion on the objective of his labour.

(III) Genuine national interests are cultural interests.

For instance, when Mr. Montagu Norman committed the Bank of "England" to underwrite German activities during the armistice period, he committed John Smith of Coventry to assist in the bombing of Coventry. Who kept Mr. Norman in office? If it be contended that Mr. Norman didn't and couldn't know the consequence of the exercise of his powers, the answer is simple. No man ought to have power for which he is not responsible.

It is the initiators of policy who are responsible for the effects of policy. The indictment for world crime requires to be directed to the identification of those individuals who licenced world crime.

There are significant facts which are available to anyone interested, but the facts are unexplained.

We know that:

The Marconi Scandal connected the effective Government of the United Kingdom with the Isaacs family during the last war.

We know that Rufus Isaacs negotiated some kind of deal with the United States Government in 1916, but we do not know the details.

We know that the Bank of "England" was a counter in the deal, because it was completely re-organised under American supervision, and physically rebuilt, after 1919.

We know that Rufus Isaacs was made Viceroy of India against all tradition, and that a raging propaganda against British control of India is proceeding in America.

It is commonly stated in well informed quarters that the Bank of "England" pursued an independent foreign policy in opposition to the Foreign Office for several of the critical armistice years.

We know much, and suspect more, regarding the interference of foreign interests in the affairs of this country for the last twenty-five years.

We know that the policy of the Bank of "England," using its own vocabulary, and the policy of the Socialist Labour Party, have been identical and that both have been directed to the establishment of a bureaucratic dictatorship of which the outlines are contained in P.E.P., the organisation largely directed by a Russian Jew. We know that the interests connected with this organisation wanted war, and screamed for it when it would have meant the annihilation by Germany of this country.

Numbers of sinister incidents marked the early months of the war. Many of them have been raised in Parliament. They require elucidation. The Canadians want to know a good many things about Mr. McKenzie King, and the Bank of Canada. When we know the answers to these questions, we shall know whether we can avoid another world war. If we have not the courage to force an answer to them, and to make it clear that we have outgrown the idea that it's no use raking up the past, and that the Statute of Limitations protects all plotters after three months, then we had better choose the type of servitude we prefer while there is yet time.

XIX

In a popular Sunday newspaper Lord Vansittart refers to "the dupes of those Leftist pan-Germans, operating under cover of anti-Nazism" in the following words, printed in block capitals, with underlining, in the original:

"This has always been a phoney war, and we may get a phoney peace, unless at long last, these people are put, and kept in their place."—*Sunday Dispatch*, August 1, 1943.

I might, perhaps, be allowed to add to the fairly modern adjective "phoney," one still newer, "microphoney."

Lord Vansinart was Chief Diplomatic Adviser to the Foreign Office. I draw a very sharp distinction between the highly-trained official, of which class he is a representative, and the infesting bureaucracy which crept in under the prestige of a totally different organisation designed for special objectives outside the routine of the business man. And I consider the paragraph I have quoted, in the light of the training and experience of its author, to be deserving of very serious attention. It is certain that it is made on the basis of exact knowledge, and I trust that the knowledge will be made available at such a time and place as will insure that it will be the basis of action.

But the general truth of it leaps to the eye. What adjective would you apply to a "British" broadcasting organisation from which, almost any night at 5.59 p.m. you may hear an unctuous voice murmur, "Good night, children; —everywhah" and at 6.01 p.m. a hearty fellow tell you, "Our bombers were out over Germany last night"? (And a good thing, too.) What adjective would you apply to a situation in which "statesmen" mouth clichés about a war for freedom, while men who fought in the first round of that alleged fight are imprisoned, without trial, without a formulated charge, and without hope of release? Or to a world in which forty million individuals, 99 per cent. of whom only wish to be allowed to mind their own business, are killing and wounding each other for some undisclosed objective known only to half a dozen men who don't agree on it themselves?

Lord Vansinart plants his indictment on too narrow a base. It is a phoney world, and a phoney war and a phoney peace are part of it.

Supposing I were to say to you, "I am organising a cricket club. You are all cricket enthusiasts, so I feel sure that you will join my club, and will deposit all your title deeds, stocks and shares, and other valuables with the secretary as a guarantee that you will obey my orders,"—you would probably remark that, under the circumstances, you think you'll play golf.

But suppose you had been brought up from birth to believe that you **must** play cricket, and you must join my club, and that, of course, placing all your eggs in my basket was only a formality. And supposing that, when you were all neatly registered, I were to say, "This organisation, which we humorously call a cricket club, is really planned for plainer living, higher thinking, and more painful dying, and you can't resign,"—you would complain, wouldn't you? To which the answer is, "No, you wouldn't," because you in fact, don't. Most of you merely say that more people must join the club—"full employment."

In the face of a worsening world situation of which the foregoing little parable is not an unfair picture, it is still possible to speak of Labour as a "class" without more than one person in a million observing that the claim of "Labour" to be a class is just elementary lack of education. Labour is a function, not a class, and a Labour Government is government by function. We hear a good deal about rooting out Fascism, largely from the "Left" which agitates for "Labour." Again, not one in a million could define Fascism, which is rule by function—the corporative state. The hand ruling the brain. But not really, you know. A gang of crooks ruling everyone. A few Labour bosses, and a majority of Finance bosses.

If this business of the relation of function to policy were really difficult to understand, then it would be possible to believe that the native intelligence quota is so low that no blame attaches to anyone for its mishandling. But the native intelligence quota is not low and the general principle is quite easy to understand. Opinion is consciously mis-directed by the agents of interests which know exactly what they are doing. Precisely, they are straining every agency of misdirection to lead the common man into a trap from which there is no escape.

At the present time there is hardly a Trades Union leader who is not telling his bemused constituents that he is going to make a new world in which "labour" is the only voice which matters. There is only one state of the world in which "labour" can even remotely claim to represent humanity, and that is—"in war, or under threat of war." In any sane civilisation "labour" has never been of so little importance, by reason of its displacement by power. And, if there is any sanity after this war, its importance will be less. The Trades union constitution-makers are the worst enemies of their audience—if their audience pays any attention to what they say. To any thoughtful Englishman (pace the Scot and Welshman) one of the more serious aspects of false propaganda is that it must inevitably recoil on the British people. It is most desirable that there should be a working agreement with America, but we are going the worst possible way to obtain one. This fact is recognised in rather unlikely quarters. The *New York Times* of May 9, 1943 commenting on the egregious film *Mission to Moscow*, remarks, "The whole effort is to represent Soviet dictatorship as advanced democracy. This film is anti-British, antiCongress, anti-democratic, and anti-truth. . . ."

According to the Communist *Daily Worker* (U.S.A.), Messrs. Warner Brothers, the Jew film monopoly, are spending half a million dollars to advertise *Mission to Moscow*—nearly twice as much as was ever previously spent on advertising one film.

Almost contemporaneously (April, 1943) a widely read periodical *America Preferred* published an article **Do We Win or Lose the War?**. In the course of this article the author remarks, "The American people are not committed to an amalgamation with the British Empire, and they will not tolerate any conspiracy to accomplish such amalgamation, once they realise fully what is intended. The American people have never voted to socialise or communise the United States, and there is no reasonable ground for believing that they ever will do so. . . . The international bankers recognise that internationalism stems from collectivism, just as economic nationalism stems from individualism, but the bankers have no intention of yielding the control of the collectivised and socialised state to the 'proletariat,' and there is no great fear that they will be required to do so. With a proper understanding and respect for the lessons of history, they realise how absurd is the 'dictatorship of the

proletariat.' This is the reason that international bankers are so generous with their subsidies to international communism. This is the reason that Mr. Hoover, Mr. Willkie, Earl Browder, Mr. Roosevelt, Judge Frankfurter, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Baruch, Ben Cohen and the partners of J. P. Morgan can be found in the same bed. Their points of agreement are fundamental. Their differences are trivial."

Amongst the less intelligent criticisms of the group of ideas known as Social Credit is that it is disguised anarchy—a kind of go-as-you-please free for all. The argument is equivalent to saying that a claim to choose whether I will play cricket or tennis is a claim to make the rules of cricket or tennis.

But the criticism has an important truth contained in it—a truth which the collectivist monopolists understand clearly. Freedom of choice does **ultimately** mean negative control. Negative control is the only control the man in the street requires. He needs a bridle on the mass expert.

If sufficient individuals disapprove of an article, it will go off the market for the simple reason that it will have no market. But only if there is an alternative. If there is no alternative, you become the tool of the gangster. If you have freedom of choice, you needn't. Social Credit is the escape from gangsterdom.

This is a gangsters' war, for the benefit of gangsters and the perpetuation of gangsterdom. You can have just as many like it as you wish. To that end, the first essential is to demand the right to interfere in everyones' business, preferably without understanding it. That encourages everyone to interfere with you, and a good time is had by all. Then use as many words which have no ascertainable meaning, as possible. Demand higher taxes for everyone and complain about your own. Otherwise leave Finance severely alone. Professor Laski will help you.

A very few years of "peace" founded on these principles will ensure a hearty welcome to the next war.